arXiv:1407.0143v3 [math.PR] 25 Mar 2015

A NONCONVENTIONAL LOCAL LIMIT THEOREM

YEOR HAFOUTA AND YURI KIFER

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS
HEBREW UNIVERSITY
JERUSALEM, ISRAEL

Abstract. Local limit theorems have their origin in the classical De Moivre–Laplace theorem and they study the asymptotic behavior as $N \to \infty$ of probabilities having the form $P\{S_N = k\}$ where $S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N F(\xi_n)$ is a sum of an integer valued function F taken on i.i.d. or Markov dependent sequence of random variables $\{\xi_j\}$. Corresponding results for lattice valued and general functions F were obtained, as well. We extend here this type of results to nonconventional sums of the form $S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N F(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n})$ which continues the recent line of research studying various limit theorems for such expressions.

1. Introduction

The classical De Moivre-Laplace theorem says that if $\xi_1, \xi_2, ...$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) 0–1 Bernoulli random variables taking on 1 with probability p and $S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \xi_n$ then the probability $P\{S_N = k\}$ is equivalent as $N \to \infty$ to $(2\pi Npq)^{-1/2} \exp(-(k - Np)^2/2Npq)$, $q = 1 - p$ uniformly in k such that $|k - Np| = o(Npq)^{2/3}$. It turns out that this type of results can be extended to "nonconventional" sums of the form

$$S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N \xi_n \xi_{2n} \cdots \xi_{\ell n}$$

where $\{\xi_j\}$ are either an i.i.d. random variables or they form a sufficiently fast mixing Markov chain.

In fact, we will deal here with more general sums of the form

$$S_N = \sum_{n=1}^N F(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n}). \tag{1.1}$$

When $F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) = \prod_{j=1}^\ell \mathbb{I}_\Gamma(x_j)$, where $\mathbb{I}_\Gamma(x) = 1$ if $x \in \Gamma$ and $= 0$ if $x \notin \Gamma$, then S_N counts the number of events $\{\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n} \in \Gamma\}$, $n \le N$ representing multiple returns to Γ. The name "nonconventional" comes from [9] where L^2 ergodic theorems for such sums with $F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) = \prod_{j=1}^\ell f_j(x_j)$ and $\{\xi_n\}$ generated by iterates of a measure preserving transformation were studied. Recently, strong laws of large numbers and the central limit theorem type results for sums (1.1) were obtained in [16] and [18], respectively, while other related limit theorems for

Date: March 27, 2015.
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 60F05 Secondary: 60J05.
Key words and phrases. local limit theorem, Markov chain, mixing, nonconventional setup.

such sums were studied in a series of papers of the second author and co-authors. Nonconventional limit theorems is probably the first topic in probability whose original motivation comes from the ergodic theory.

Modern proofs of local limit theorems adopt usually the approach based on the the perturbation theory of Fourier operators which goes back to [22] (see also [23]). This together with quasi-compactness (or spectral gap, non-arthmeticity) assumptions yields appropriate estimates of characteristic functions of sums under consideration implying the result (see, for instance, [12]). The characteristic functions of the sums (1.1) cannot be studied via iterates of one Fourier operator, and so we cannot benefit here from the full strength of the above method though some elements of existing proofs of local limit theorems will be employed here, as well. We observe that a local limit theorem can only be formulated if the variance in the corresponding central limit theorem is positive and since the latter question was not studied extensively before in the nonconventional setup we deal with it here, as well. Usually, proofs of local limit theorems rely, in particular, on a corresponding central limit theorem result and we employ this argument also here but, in fact, we consider a slightly different from [18] version of a nonconventional central limit theorem which will be introduced in the next section. Our results can be extended to sums of more general expressions $F(\xi_{q_1(n)}, \xi_{q_2(n)}, ..., \xi_{q_\ell(n)})$ where $q_1(n), ..., q_\ell(n)$ are certain integer valued functions similar to [18] but in order not to overload the exposition we will restrict ourselves with the sums of the form (1.1). A somewhat related but still different problem on almost sure local limit theorem (see, for instance, [11] and references there) will not be considered here in the nonconventional setup.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section we state our main results and comment on them. In Section 3 we derive our results on positivity of the limiting variance while in Sections 4–6 our nonconventional local limit theorems will be proved.

2. Preliminaries and main results

Our setup consists of a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ together with a stationary Markov chain $\xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, ...$ evolving on a Polish space $\mathcal{X}$ equiped with a Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{B}$. Let $P(x, \Gamma) = P\{\xi_1 \in \Gamma | \xi_0 = x\}$ be the transition probability of the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$, μ be its stationary probability so that $\int d\mu(x) P(x, \Gamma) = \mu(\Gamma)$ for any $\Gamma \in \mathcal{B}$, and let $F = F(x_1, ..., x_\ell)$, $\ell \geq 1$ be a Borel function on $\mathcal{X}^\ell = \mathcal{X} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{X}$ such that

$$b^2 = \int F^2(x_1, ..., x_\ell) d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_\ell) < \infty. \tag{2.1}$$

Our main goal in this paper is to derive a local limit theorem for sums given by (1.1) and in order to simplify formulas we assume also a centering condition

$$\bar{F} = \int F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) d\mu(x_1) \dots d\mu(x_\ell) = 0 \tag{2.2}$$

which is not a restriction since we always can replace F by $F - \bar{F}$.

Introduce σ-algebras $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma\{\xi_j,\, j \leq n\}$ and $\mathcal{F}^m = \sigma\{\xi_j,\, j \geq m\}$ and define the ψ-mixing (dependence) coefficient by

$$\psi(m) = \sup \left\{ \Big| \frac{P(\Gamma \cap \Psi)}{P(\Gamma) P(\Psi)} - 1 \Big| : \Gamma \in \mathcal{F}_n,\, \Psi \in \mathcal{F}^{n+m};\, P(\Gamma), P(\Psi) > 0 \right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

The process $\{\xi_n\}$ is called ψ-mixing if all $\psi(m)$ are finite and $\psi(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. To avoid excessive technicalities we will work here under

2.1. **Assumption.** For some $\alpha > 0$ and any $m \geq 1$,

$$\psi(m) \leq \alpha^{-1} e^{-\alpha m}. \tag{2.4}$$

The exponentially fast decay (2.4) of the ψ-mixing coefficient can be relaxed to some polynomial decay but it is known from [5] that in the Markov chains case any decay $\psi(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$ yields already an exponentially fast decay of $\psi(m)$. It is known also (see, for instance, [3], Ch. 7 and 21) that (2.4) holds true if $\{\xi_n\}$ is a finite state irreducible and aperiodic Markov chain and, in fact, [5] provides necessary and sufficient conditions for (2.4) to take place. In particular, (2.4) will be satisfied if there exists a positive integer n_0, a probability measure η on $\mathcal{X}$ and a number $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ such that for each $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and any Borel set $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{X}$,

$$\gamma^{-1}\eta(\Gamma) \geq P(n_0, x, \Gamma) \geq \gamma\eta(\Gamma) \tag{2.5}$$

where $P(k, x, \cdot)$ is the k-step transition probability of the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$. Employing the technique from [18] we can obtain our results under weaker mixing conditions on expense of other assumptions on the function F. Observe that the right hand side of (2.5) implies also the geometric ergodicity condition

$$\|P(n, x, \cdot) - \mu\| \leq \beta^{-1} e^{-\beta n},\ \beta > 0, \tag{2.6}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the total variation norm, and under (2.6) the results of the present paper can be obtained for any initial distribution of the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$ and not only for the stationary one.

As usual, our local limit theorem will rely on a version of a nonconventional central limit theorem which will be presented in a more general form than needed here and under slightly different assumptions than in [18]. It will be convenient to represent the function $F = F(x_1, ..., x_\ell)$ in the form

$$F = F_1(x_1) + \cdots + F_\ell(x_1, ..., x_\ell) \tag{2.7}$$

where

$$F_\ell = F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) - \int F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) d\mu(x_\ell) \tag{2.8}$$

and for $i < \ell$,

$$F_i(x_1, ..., x_i) = \int F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) d\mu(x_{i+1}) ... d\mu(x_\ell) - \int F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) d\mu(x_i) ... d\mu(x_\ell) \tag{2.9}$$

which ensures, in particular, that for all $x_1, ..., x_{i-1} \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\int F_i(x_1, ..., x_{i-1}, x_i) d\mu(x_i) = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Now we write

$$S_N(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} S_{i,N}(t) \ \text{ where } \ S_{i,N}(t) = \sum_{n=1}^{[Nt]} F_i(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{in}) \tag{2.11}$$

and we abbreviate $S_N = S_N(1)$ and $S_{i,N} = S_{i,N}(1)$.

2.2. **Theorem.** *Suppose that (2.1), (2.2) and Assumption 2.1 hold true. Then the ℓ-dimensional process $\{N^{-1/2}S_{j,N}(t/j) : 1 \le j \le \ell\}$ converges in distribution to a Gaussian process $\{\zeta_j(t) : 1 \le j \le \ell\}$ with stationary independent increments, zero means and covariances having the form $E(\zeta_i(s)\zeta_j(t)) = D_{i,j}\min(s,t)$, $i,j = 1,...,\ell$. The process $N^{-1/2}S_N(\cdot)$ itself converges in distribution to the Gaussian process $\zeta(\cdot)$ having a representation in the form*

$$\zeta(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \zeta_i(it)$$

which may have dependent increments.

In spite of different assumptions on the function F here in comparison to [18] this theorem follows in the same way as the main result of [18] which will be explained at the beginning of Section 3.

A local limit theorem can only be meaningful if the variance of a limiting Gaussian distribution is strictly positive. This question was addressed in [15] only in a very particular case (which corresponds to $\ell = 1$ in our setup) and it was not dealt with at all in [18]. Here we will establish some sufficient conditions for positivity of the limiting variance in our Markov chains setup.

2.3. **Theorem.** *(i) Set $\sigma_N^2 = varS_N = E(S_N - ES_N)^2$ and suppose that (2.4) holds true. Then the limit*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N}\sigma_N^2 = \sigma^2 = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} ES_N^2 \tag{2.12}$$

exists.

(ii) Let $\{\xi_n^{(1)}\}$, $\{\xi_n^{(2)}\}$, ...,$\{\xi_n^{(\ell)}\}$ be ℓ independent copies of the stationary Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$ with the initial distribution μ and set $U_{\ell,N} = \sum_{n=1}^{N} F_\ell(\xi_n^{(1)}, \xi_{2n}^{(2)}, ..., \xi_{\ell n}^{(\ell)})$. Then

$$s_\ell^2 = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} varU_{\ell,N} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} EU_{\ell,N}^2 \tag{2.13}$$

exists and

$$\sigma^2 \ge \frac{1}{2\ell} s_\ell^2. \tag{2.14}$$

Of course, if $F_\ell = 0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. then $s_\ell = 0$ but in this case F depends essentially only on $\ell - 1$ variables and we can apply the same arguments with $\ell - 1$ in place of ℓ. Next, observe that specifying a bit our estimates it is possible to improve the right hand side of (2.14) to $\frac{1}{\ell} s_\ell^2$. Nevertheless, the main purpose of Theorem 2.3(ii) is to obtain a sufficient condition for positivity of σ^2 relying on the well known conditions of positivity of the limiting variance of the stationary Markov chain $\Xi_n^{(\ell)} = (\xi_n^{(1)}, \xi_{2n}^{(2)}, ..., \xi_{\ell n}^{(\ell)})$ which is ψ-mixing with the same $\psi(n)$-coefficient as $\{\xi_n\}$ itself. Namely, $s_\ell^2 > 0$ unless F_ℓ can be represented in the form $F_\ell(\Xi_1^{(\ell)}(\omega)) = g(\theta\omega) - g(\omega)$ where θ is the P-preserving paths' shift transformation for the stationary process $\{\Xi_n^{(\ell)}\}$ so that $\Xi_n^{(\ell)} = \Xi_0^{(\ell)}(\theta^n\omega)$ (see Chapter 18 in [13]). We observe also that the assertion of Theorem 2.3 remain valid for any stationary (and not only Markov) process with a ψ-mixing coefficient decaying much slower than in (2.4) (see the proof in the next section). Furthermore, these assertions hold also true for sufficiently fast ψ-mixing dynamical systems (such as subshifts of finite type, Anosov diffeomorphisms, expanding transformations etc.) where in place of

independent copies of the process $\{\xi_n\}$ we should consider the product of ℓ copies of the corresponding dynamical system.

Introduce correlation coefficients

(2.15)
$$\rho_k = \sup_{n\geq 1}\{\mathrm{corr}(X,Y):\ X\in L_2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}_n,P),\ Y\in L_2(\Omega,\mathcal{F}^{n+k},P)\} = \|Q^k\|_{L_2^0(\mathcal{X},\mu)},$$

where $Qg(x)=\int_{\mathcal{X}} P(x,dy)g(y)$ is the transition operator and $L_2^0(\mathcal{X},\mu)=\{g\in L_2(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{B},\mu):\int g d\mu=0\}$. We consider also contraction coefficients

$$\delta_k = \sup_{x,y\in\mathcal{X},\Gamma\in\mathcal{B}} |P(k,x,\Gamma)-P(k,y,\Gamma)|. \tag{2.16}$$

In some of the assertions we will assume that

$$\rho_\ell < 1. \tag{2.17}$$

It was indicated to us by M. Peligrad that the arguments in the proof of Lemma 4.1 of [26] yield that $\rho_\ell\leq\sqrt{\delta}_\ell$, and so if

$$\delta_\ell < 1 \tag{2.18}$$

then (2.17) holds true.

Next, we provide additional more specific sufficient conditions for the positivity of σ^2.

2.4. **Theorem.** *(i) Let (2.4) and (2.17) hold true. If $\sigma^2=0$ then $F_\ell=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e.*

(ii) Suppose that (2.4) and (2.17) hold true and assume that $P(x,\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ for all $x\in supp\mu$. Then $\sigma^2=0$ if and only if $F=0$ $\mu^\ell=\mu\times\cdots\times\mu$-almost everywhere (a.e.);

(iii) Suppose that the conditions of (ii) hold true except that in place of the absolute continuity requirement there we assume here that F is continuous on $(supp\mu)^\ell = supp\mu\times\cdots\times supp\mu$. Then $\sigma^2=0$ if and only if $F=0$ identically on $(supp\mu)^\ell$.

2.5. **Remark.** In principle, we could exclude $F_\ell=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. from the beginning since if this happens then F can be viewed as a function of $\ell-1$ variables and we could study then the problem with $\ell-1$ in place of ℓ. Thus, from the beginning we could assume that ℓ is the maximal number such that $F_\ell=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. does not happen.

Observe that when $\xi_0,\xi_1,\xi_2,...$ are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) random variables with values in $\mathcal{X}$ then $\rho_k=\delta_k=\psi(k)=0$ for all $k\geq 1$, and so (2.4), (2.17) and (2.18) hold true. The inequality (2.17) is known to hold true, for instance, when the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$ is reversible and geometrically ergodic (see [25]). Some spectral conditions for (2.17) to hold true can be found in [3]. The validity of (2.18) can be ensured assuming only the right hand side of (2.5) with $n_0=\ell$. When $\mathcal{X}$ is a finite state space conditions for (2.17) and (2.18) to be valid can be easily written (see, for instance, [6], [3] and referencies there). We will need (2.17) (or (2.18)) in order to rely on lower bounds for variances of sums of (different) functions of Markov chains from [24] while the corresponding lower bound from [26] can also be used if (2.18) holds true.

As in many expositions of the (conventional) local limit theorem we distinguish between a lattice and a nonlattice cases which take in our circumstances the following form. For any $x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}\in\mathcal{X}$ set

(2.19)

$$A_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}=\{h\ge 0:\ F(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1},x)\in\{kh:\ k\in\mathbb{Z}\}\text{ for }\mu-\text{almost all }x\in\mathcal{X}\}$$

and

$$B_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}=\{h\ge 0:\ F(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1},x)-F(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1},y)\in\{kh:\ k\in\mathbb{Z}\}\text{ for }\mu^2-\text{almost all }(x,y)\in\mathcal{X}^2\}. \tag{2.20}$$

If $B_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}\ne\emptyset$ we define

$$h(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})=\sup\{h:\ h\in B_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}\}. \tag{2.21}$$

We call the case a lattice one if there exists $h>0$ such that

$$h(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})=h\in A_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}\quad for\ \ \mu^{\ell-1}-\text{almost all }\ (x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}). \tag{2.22}$$

If

$$\mu^{\ell-1}\{(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}):\ B_{x_1,...,x_{\ell-1}}=\emptyset\}>0 \tag{2.23}$$

then we call the case a non-lattice one. Observe, that there are other cases beyond what we designated as a lattice and a non-lattice case. For instance, $h(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})$ may take on several (or countably many, or continuum) values on subsets of $\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ having positive (or zero in the continuum values case) $\mu^{\ell-1}$-measure. Some of these cases can be treated too but in order not to overload the exposition we do not consider them here.

Now we can state our nonconventional local limit theorems which are considered both in a lattice and a non-lattice cases.

2.6. **Theorem.** *Suppose that $\xi_0,\xi_1,\xi_2,...$ is a Markov chain having transition probabilities satisfying (2.5) with $n_0=\ell$. Assume (2.1) and (2.2) with $b\ne 0$ and that the equality $F_\ell=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. does not hold true. Then σ^2 in (2.12) is positive and for any real continuous function g on $\mathbb{R}$ with a compact support*

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\sup_u|\sigma\sqrt{2\pi N}Eg(S_N-u)-e^{-\frac{u^2}{2N\sigma^2}}\int g d\mathcal{L}_h|=0 \tag{2.24}$$

where the supremum is taken over $u\in\{kh:\ k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ in the lattice case (2.22) and over all real u in the non-lattice case. In the latter case we set $h=0$ and $\mathcal{L}_0$ is then the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ while in the lattice case $\mathcal{L}_h$, $h>0$ is the measure assigning mass h to each point kh, $k\in\mathbb{Z}$.

The proof of Theorem 2.6 will rely on estimates of the characteristic function $\varphi_N(\theta)$ of S_N of the form e^{-qN} for θ belonging to a compact set disjoint from 0 and of the form $e^{-rN\theta^2}$ for θ close to 0. These are obtained employing some large deviations results from [7], [1] and [17]. From these estimates Theorem 2.6 will follow essentially in a standard way. When $\mathcal{X}$ is a finite state space Theorem 2.6 requires that the transition matrix of the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$ consists of positive entries only. Actually, in this case we can obtain the nonconventional local limit theorem in a bit more general situation.

2.7. **Theorem.** *Let $\{\xi_n\}$ be a Markov chain with a finite state space $\mathcal{X}$ and a matrix of transition probabilities $\Pi = (p_{ij})_{i,j\in\mathcal{X}}$ such that for some k the matrix $\Pi^k = (p_{ij}^{(k)})_{i,j\in\mathcal{X}}$ consists of all positive entries and*

$$\min_{i,j}\sum_k \min(p_{ik}^{(\ell)}, p_{jk}^{(\ell)}) > 0 \text{ and } \min_{i,j}\sum_k \min(p_{ki}^{(\ell)}, p_{kj}^{(\ell)}) > 0. \tag{2.25}$$

Assume (2.2) and that F_ℓ does not equal zero identically. Then both in the lattice and the non-lattice cases the local limit theorem in the form (2.24) takes place.

We observe that (2.18) implies that $\delta_\ell < 1$ and the latter is equivalent to the first inequality in (2.25) (see [6]). The first and the second inequalities in (2.25) mean that the matrices $\Pi^\ell(\Pi^\ell)^*$ and $(\Pi^\ell)^*\Pi^\ell$, respectively, have all positive entries. The conditions of Theorem 2.7 concerning Π hold true if, for instance, Π is self adjoint and Π^2 has all positive entries.

3. Positivity of variance

In this section we explain first why the proof of Theorem 2.2 goes through in the same way as in [18] and after that we derive Theorem 2.4.

We will rely on the following result whose proof goes through in the same way as in Lemma 3.1 from [14]. Let $h = h(y,z)$, $y \in \mathcal{X}^k$, $z \in \mathcal{X}^l$ be a Borel measurable function on $\mathcal{X}^{k+l}$. Let $X = (X_1, ..., X_k) : \Omega \to \mathcal{X}^k$ and $Y = (Y_1, ..., Y_l) : \Omega \to \mathcal{X}^l$ be sequences of $\mathcal{X}$-valued random variables (random "vectors") such that X is $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable and Y is $\mathcal{F}^{n+m}$-measurable. Suppose that $E|h(X,Y)| < \infty$ and $r(x) = E|h(x,Y)| < \infty$ for any $x \in \mathcal{X}^k$. Then with probability one,

$$|E(h(X,Y)|\mathcal{F}_n) - g(X)| \le \psi(m)r(X) \tag{3.1}$$

where $g(x) = Eh(x,Y)$.

Now observe that special Hölder continuity assumptions imposed on F in [18] were only needed because we did not assume there measurability of ξ_n with respect to $\mathcal{F}_n$ but required only some estimates on the error when replacing ξ_n by $E(\xi_n|\mathcal{F}_{n+m})$. To use this we had to estimate what happens when ξ_n is replaced by $E(\xi_n|\mathcal{F}_{n+m})$ inside F which could be done only relying on Hölder continuity (or better regularity) of F. In the present paper $\mathcal{F}_n$ is generated by $\xi_0, \xi_1, ..., \xi_n$, i.e. ξ_n is $\mathcal{F}_n$-measurable, and we can apply (3.1) directly to F without any need of Hölder continuity as exhibited below.

We will show next how to obtain variance and covariance estimates needed to employ the method from [18] to the setup of Theorem 2.2 using directly (3.1) without any need of regularity assumptions on F. Define inductively for $i = \ell - 1, \ell - 2, ..., 0$,

$$G_i^2(x_1, ..., x_i) = EG_{i+1}^2(x_1, ..., x_i, \xi_1) = \int G_{i+1}^2(x_1, ..., x_i, y)d\mu(y) \tag{3.2}$$

where $G_\ell^2 = F^2$ and $G_0^2 = EG_1^2(\xi_1)$. Then by (3.1) considered with $X = (\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{(i-1)n})$ and $Y = \xi_{in}$, $i = \ell, \ell-1, ..., 1$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} EF^2(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n}) &\le (1+\psi(n))EG_{\ell-1}^2(\xi_n, ..., \xi_{(\ell-1)n}) \\ &\le \cdots \le (1+\psi(n))^\ell G_0^2 = (1+\psi(n))^\ell b^2 \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where b^2 is given by (2.1). Next, observe that by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$F_i^2(x_1,...,x_i) \le 2(\int F(x_1,...,x_\ell)d\mu(x_{i+1})...d\mu(x_\ell))^2 \tag{3.4}$$
$$+2(\int F(x_1,...,x_\ell)d\mu(x_i)...d\mu(x_\ell))^2 \le 2\int F^2(x_1,...,x_\ell)d\mu(x_{i+1})...d\mu(x_\ell)$$
$$+2\int F^2(x_1,...,x_\ell)d\mu(x_i)...d\mu(x_\ell) = 2G_i^2(x_1,...,x_i) + 2G_{i-1}^2(x_1,...,x_{i-1}),$$

and so, as in (3.3),

$$EF_i^2(\xi_n,...,\xi_{in}) \le 2(1+\psi(n))^{i-1}(2+\psi(n))b^2. \tag{3.5}$$

Now we estimate covariances for $j \ge i$ and $m > k$ which by (3.1) considered with $X = \xi_k,...,\xi_{ik};\xi_m,...,\xi_{(j-1)m}$ and $Y = \xi_{jm}$ together with (2.10) yields

$$A_{i,j,k,m} = |E(F_i(\xi_k,...,\xi_{ik})F_j(\xi_m,...,\xi_{jm}))| \tag{3.6}$$
$$\le \psi(\min(m, jm-ik))ER(\xi_k,...,\xi_{ik};\xi_m,...,\xi_{(j-1)m})$$

where

$$R(x_1,...,x_i;y_1,...,y_{j-1}) = |F_i(x_1,...,x_i)|E|F_j(y_1,...,y_{j-1},\xi_1)|$$
$$\le \tfrac{1}{2}F_i^2(x_1,...,x_i) + \tfrac{1}{2}EF_j^2(y_1,...,y_{j-1},\xi_1).$$

Hence, by (3.5),

$$ER(\xi_k,...,\xi_{ik};\xi_m,...,\xi_{(j-1)m}) \le \big((1+\psi(k))^{i-1}(2+\psi(k)) \tag{3.7}$$
$$+(1+\psi(m))^{j-1}(2+\psi(m))\big)b^2.$$

Observe also that by (2.10), (3.1) and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for all $i = 1,...,\ell$,

$$|EF_i(\xi_n,...,\xi_{in})| \le \psi(n)EQ(\xi_n,...,\xi_{(i-1)n}) \tag{3.8}$$

where

$$Q(x_1,...,x_{i-1}) = E|F_i(x_1,...,x_{i-1},\xi_1)| \le (EF_i^2(x_1,...,x_{i-1},\xi_1))^{1/2}.$$

Again, by (3.5),

$$EQ(\xi_n,...,\xi_{(i-1)n}) \le \sqrt{2}(1+\psi(n))^{(i-1)/2}(2+\psi(n))^{1/2}|b|. \tag{3.9}$$

The estimates (3.4)–(3.9) suffice in order to employ martingale approximations and to obtain limiting covariances as in [18] which yields Theorem 2.2 in the same way as there. □

Next, we deal with Theorem 2.3. First observe that the proof of existence of the limit (2.12) is the same as in [18] relying on the variance and covariance estimates above, and so we concentrate on the proof of the assertion (ii) of Theorem 2.3. Set $N_\ell = [N(1-\frac{1}{2\ell})]+1$,

$$S_{\ell,N}^{(1)} = \sum_{n=1}^{N_\ell-1} F_\ell(\xi_n,...,\xi_{\ell n}) \text{ and } S_{\ell,N}^{(2)} = S_{\ell,N} - S_{\ell,N}^{(1)}. \tag{3.10}$$

Thus,

$$\sigma_N^2 = \mathrm{var}S_N = \mathrm{var}(\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1} S_{i,N} + S_{\ell,N}^{(1)}) + \mathrm{var}S_{\ell,N}^{(2)} \tag{3.11}$$
$$+2\textstyle\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\sum_{m=N_\ell}^{N} B_{i,k,m} + 2\sum_{k=1}^{N_\ell-1}\sum_{m=N_\ell}^{N} B_{\ell,k.m}$$

where for $i = 1,2,...,\ell$,

$$B_{i,k,m} = E\big((F_i(\xi_k,...,\xi_{ik}) - EF_i(\xi_k,...,\xi_{ik}))(F_\ell(\xi_m,...,\xi_{\ell m}) - EF_\ell(\xi_m,...,\xi_{\ell m}))\big).$$

In order to prove Theorem 2.3(ii) we will show first that the multiple sums in (3.11) are bounded after which it will remain only to obtain that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N}\mathrm{var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N} > 0. \tag{3.12}$$

Clearly,

$$|B_{i,k,m}| \le A_{i,\ell,k,m} + |EF_i(\xi_k, ..., \xi_{ik})||EF_\ell(\xi_m, ..., \xi_{\ell m})|. \tag{3.13}$$

Observe that

$$\ell N_\ell - (\ell - 1)N \ge N/2, \tag{3.14}$$

and so when $m \ge N_\ell$, $i \le \ell - 1$ and $k \le N$ we can estimate the right hand side of (3.13) by means of (2.4) and (3.6)–(3.9) which yields that two double sums in (3.11) are bounded by constants independent of N.

Next, we study

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\ell,m,n} = E\big(F_\ell(\xi_m, \xi_{2m}, ..., \xi_{\ell m})F_\ell(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n})\big) \\ -EF_\ell(\xi_m, \xi_{2m}, ..., \xi_{\ell m})EF_\ell(\xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{\ell n}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

for $m, n \ge N_\ell$ in more details. The product of expectations in (3.15) is small by (3.8) and (3.9), and so we have to deal mainly with the expectation of the product here. Set

$$H^{(\ell)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_\ell;\, y_1, ..., y_\ell) = F_\ell(x_1, ..., x_\ell)F_\ell(y_1, ..., y_\ell)$$

and define recursively for $j = \ell, \ell - 1, ..., 1$,

$$H^{(j-1)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_{j-1};\, y_1, ..., y_{j-1}) = \int H^{(j)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_j;\, y_1, ..., y_j)d\mu_{j|n-m|}(x_j, y_j)$$

where μ_k is the distribution of the pair (ξ_0, ξ_k).

Next, observe that

$$H^{(0)}_{m,n} = E\big(F_\ell(\xi^{(1)}_m, \xi^{(2)}_{2m}, ..., \xi^{(\ell)}_{\ell m})F_\ell(\xi^{(1)}_n, \xi^{(2)}_{2n}, ..., \xi^{(\ell)}_{\ell n})\big) \tag{3.16}$$

and that $EF_\ell(\xi^{(1)}_m, \xi^{(2)}_{2m}, ..., \xi^{(\ell)}_{\ell m}) = 0$ by (2.2). Applying (3.1) with $X = (\xi_m, ..., \xi_{(j-1)m};\, \xi_n, ..., \xi_{(j-1)n})$ and $Y = (\xi_{jm}, \xi_{jn})$ we obtain that for any $m, n \ge N_\ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} \big|EH^{(j)}_{m,n}(\xi_m, \xi_{2m}, ..., \xi_{jm};\, \xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{jn}) \\ -EH^{(j-1)}_{m,n}(\xi_m, \xi_{2m}, ..., \xi_{(j-1)m};\, \xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{(j-1)n})\big| \\ \le \psi([\tfrac{N}{2}])E\hat{H}^{(j-1)}_{m,n}(\xi_m, \xi_{2m}, ..., \xi_{(j-1)m};\, \xi_n, \xi_{2n}, ..., \xi_{(j-1)n}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\hat{H}^{(j-1)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_{j-1};\, y_1, ..., y_{j-1}) = E|H^{(j)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_{j-1}, \xi_{jm};\, y_1, ..., y_{j-1}, \xi_{jn})|.$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} H^{(\ell)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_\ell;\, y_1, ..., y_\ell) = |F_\ell(x_1, ..., x_\ell)||F_\ell(y_1, ..., y_\ell)| \\ \le \tfrac{1}{2}F^2_\ell(x_1, ..., x_\ell) + \tfrac{1}{2}F^2_\ell(y_1, ..., y_\ell) \end{aligned}$$

we obtain recursively from the above that for $j = \ell - 1, \ell - 2, ..., 0$,

$$\hat{H}^{(j)}_{m,n}(x_1, ..., x_j;\, y_1, ..., y_j) \le 2G^2_j(x_1, ..., x_j) + 2G^2_j(y_1, ..., y_j) \tag{3.18}$$

with G^2_j defined by (3.2). In the same way as in (3.3) we see that

$$EG^2_j(\xi_n, ..., \xi_{jn}) \le (1 + \psi(n))^j b^2. \tag{3.19}$$

Now, combining (3.17)–(3.19) we obtain that

(3.20)
$$\big|E\big(F_\ell(\xi_m,\xi_{2m},...,\xi_{\ell m})F_\ell(\xi_n,\xi_{2n},...,\xi_{\ell n})\big)-H^{(0)}_{m,n}\big|\le\psi([\frac{N}{2}])\ell(1+\psi(N_\ell))^\ell b^2.$$

Set

$$U^{(2)}_{\ell,N}=\sum_{n=N_\ell}^{N}F_\ell(\xi^{(1)}_n,\xi^{(2)}_{2n},...,\xi^{(\ell)}_{\ell n}).$$

Then by (3.8), (3.9), (3.15), (3.16) and (3.20),

$$|{\rm var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}-{\rm var}U^{(2)}_{\ell,N}|\le\frac{N^2}{4\ell^2}\psi([\frac{N}{2}])(2+\psi([\frac{N}{2}]))^\ell b^2(\ell+2\psi([\frac{N}{2}])). \tag{3.21}$$

Next, observe that since $\Xi^{(\ell)}_n=(\xi^{(1)}_n,\xi^{(2)}_{2n},...,\xi^{(\ell)}_{\ell n})$ is a stationary process then

$${\rm var}U^{(2)}_{\ell,N}={\rm var}U_{\ell,N-N_\ell}. \tag{3.22}$$

It is a standard fact that under (2.4) (and even much slower ψ-mixing) the limit (2.13) exists (see, for instance, [13] or [3]), and so

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}{\rm var}U^{(2)}_{\ell,N}=\frac{1}{2\ell}s^2_\ell. \tag{3.23}$$

Now, (3.12) follows from (3.21) and (3.23) so that (2.14) holds true in view of (3.11) and (3.13), completing the proof of Theorem 2.3. □

Next we prove Theorem 2.4. In order to obtain (3.12) we set for each $\bar x=(x_{N_\ell},x_{N_\ell+1},...,x_{(\ell-1)N})$,

$$S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}(\bar x)=\sum_{n=N_\ell}^{N}F_\ell(x_n,x_{2n},...,x_{(\ell-1)n},\xi_{\ell n})$$

where in the case $\ell=1$ we take $S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}(\bar x)=S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}$. Put also $\sigma^2_{N_\ell,N}(\bar x)={\rm var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}(\bar x)$. Then applying (3.1) with $X=\bar\xi=(\xi_{N_\ell},\xi_{N_\ell+1},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)N})$ and $Y=(\xi_{\ell N_\ell},...,\xi_{\ell N})$ we obtain taking into account (3.5) and (3.14) that

$$|E\sigma^2_{N_\ell,N}(\bar\xi)-{\rm var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}|\le 2N^2(2+\psi(1))^{\ell+1}\psi([N/2])b^2. \tag{3.24}$$

Next, we apply to $S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}(\bar x)$ Proposition 13 from [24] (if we assume (2.18) then we can rely on Proposition 4.1 from [26]) in order to conclude that

$${\rm var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}(\bar x)\ge c_\ell\sum_{n=N_\ell}^{N}{\rm var}F_\ell(x_n,...,x_{(\ell-1)n},\xi_{\ell n}) \tag{3.25}$$

where $c_\ell=\frac{1-\rho_\ell}{1+\rho_\ell}$ under (2.17) (and $c_\ell=\frac{1-\delta_\ell}{4}$ under (2.18)). Observe that by (2.10) and the stationarity, for any $y_1,...,y_{\ell-1}$,

$$q(y_1,...,y_{\ell-1})={\rm var}F_\ell(y_1,...,y_{\ell-1},\xi_{\ell n})$$
$$={\rm var}F_\ell(y_1,...,y_{\ell-1},\xi_1)=EF^2_\ell(y_1,...,y_{\ell-1},\xi_1).$$

Applying $\ell-1$ times (3.1) and using (3.6) we obtain easily that

$$|Eq(\xi_n,\xi_{2n},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)n})-\textstyle\int q(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_{\ell-1})|$$
$$\le 2(\ell-1)\psi(n)(2+\psi(n))^{\ell+1}b^2. \tag{3.26}$$

This together with (2.4), (3.11), (3.13), (3.24) and (3.25) yields that

$$\liminf_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}\mathrm{var}S^{(2)}_{\ell,N}\geq\frac{c_\ell}{\ell}\int q(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_{\ell-1}). \tag{3.27}$$

If $\sigma^2=0$ then

$$\int q(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_{\ell-1})=\int F^2_\ell(x_1,...,x_\ell)d\mu(x_1)...d\mu(x_\ell)=0, \tag{3.28}$$

i.e.

$$F_\ell(x_1,...,x_\ell)=0\quad\mu^\ell-\text{a.e.} \tag{3.29}$$

which proves the assertion (i) of Theorem 2.4.

Next, introduce probability measures $\mu_{i,n}$ on $\mathcal{X}^i$ such that for any Borel $\Gamma\subset\mathcal{X}^i$,

$$\mu_{i,n}(\Gamma)=P\{(\xi_n,\xi_{2n},...,\xi_{in})\in\Gamma\}.$$

If $\Gamma=\Gamma_1\times\Gamma_2\times\cdots\times\Gamma_i$ is a product set with Borel $\Gamma_1,...,\Gamma_i\subset\mathcal{X}$ then

$$\mu_{i,n}(\Gamma)=\int_{\Gamma_1}d\mu(x_1)\int_{\Gamma_2}P(n,x_1,dx_2)...\int_{\Gamma_i}P(n,x_{i-1},dx_i).$$

Now assume that we are in the circumstances of Theorem 2.4(ii), i.e. that $P(x,\cdot)$ is absolutely continuous with respect to μ for all $x\in\mathrm{supp}\mu$. Then by the Chapman–Kolmogorov formula $P(n,x,\cdot)$ is also absolutely continuous with respect to μ for all $x\in\mathrm{supp}\mu$.

We claim now that $\mu_{i,n}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mu^i=\mu\times\cdots\times\mu$ which will be proved by induction in i. For $i=1$ this is clear since $\mu_{1,n}=\mu$. Suppose this holds true for $i=j$ and prove it for $i=j+1$. Let $\Gamma\subset\mathcal{X}^{j+1}$ and $\mu^{j+1}(\Gamma)=0$. By the Fubini theorem for μ^j-almost all $(x_1,...,x_j)$ the set $\Gamma_{x_1,...,x_j}=\{x\in\mathcal{X}:(x_1,...,x_j,x)\in\Gamma\}$ satisfies $\mu(\Gamma_{x_1,...,x_j})=0$. By the induction hypothesis $\mu_{j,n}\prec\mu^j$, and so $\mu(\Gamma_{x_1,...,x_j})=0$ for $\mu_{j,n}$-almost all $(x_1,...,x_j)$. From the definition of measures $\mu_{i,n}$, the disintegration of measures theorem (see §3, Ch. 6 in [2]) and the Markov property we conclude that

$$\mu_{j+1,n}(\Gamma)=\int_{\mathcal{X}^j}d\mu_{j,n}(x_1,...,x_j)P(n,x_j,\Gamma_{x_1,...,x_j})=0$$

since $P(n,x,\cdot)\prec\mu$, completing the induction step.

Now, since $\mu_{\ell,n}\prec\mu$ then $F_\ell(\xi_n,\xi_{2n},...,\xi_{\ell n})=0$ with probability one for all n, and so $S_{\ell,N}=0$ P-a.s. Hence,

$$S_N=\sum_{i=1}^{\ell-1}S_{i,N}\quad P-\text{a.s.} \tag{3.30}$$

Repeating the above argument for $\ell-1$ in place of ℓ we obtain that $F_{\ell-1}(x_1,...,x_{\ell-1})=0$ $\mu^{\ell-1}$-a.e. and $F_{\ell-1}(\xi_n,\xi_{2n},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)n})=0$ P-a.s. for all n, and so $S_{\ell-1,N}=0$ P-a.s., as well. Continuing in the same way we obtain finally from (2.7) that $F(x_1,...,x_\ell)=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. proving the assertion (ii).

In the assertion (iii) we assume that F is continuous on $(\mathrm{supp}\mu)^\ell$ and then the absolute continuity arguments above are not needed since from (3.29) we obtain directly in this case that $F_\ell(x_1,...,x_\ell)=0$ for all $x_1,...,x_\ell\in\mathrm{supp}\mu$. Since

$$P\{(\xi_n,...,\xi_{\ell n})\notin(\mathrm{supp}\mu)^\ell\}\leq\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}P\{\xi_{in}\notin\mathrm{supp}\mu\}=\ell\mu(\mathcal{X}\setminus\mathrm{supp}\mu)=0$$

we obtain again that $F_\ell(\xi_n, ..., \xi_{\ell n}) = 0$ P-a.s. and proceeding as above we conclude that $F(x_1, ..., x_\ell) = 0$ not only μ^ℓ-a.e. but for all $x_1, ..., x_\ell \in \text{supp}\mu$ in view of continuity of F here, completing the proof. □

4. Local limit theorem

In this and the next two sections we will prove Theorems 2.6 and 2.7. The arguments of the present section are rather standard and they are valid in a more general framework while the ones in the next sections will be heavily affected by our setups. The proof of (2.24) will consist mainly of the study of the characteristic function of the sum S_N. First, observe that in view of Theorem 10.7 from [4] (see also Section 10.4 there and Lemma IV.5 together with arguments of Section VI.4 in [12]) it suffices to prove (2.24) for all continuous complex-valued functions g on $\mathbb{R} = (-\infty, \infty)$ such that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |g(x)|dx < \infty \tag{4.1}$$

and its Fourier transform

$$\hat{g}(\lambda) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\lambda x} g(x)dx, \ \lambda \in \mathbb{R} \tag{4.2}$$

vanishes outside of a finite interval $[-L, L]$. In particular, the inversion formula

$$g(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda x} \hat{g}(\lambda)d\lambda \tag{4.3}$$

holds true.

Hence,

$$Eg(S_N - u) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_N(\lambda) e^{-i\lambda u} \hat{g}(\lambda)d\lambda \tag{4.4}$$

where $\varphi_N(\lambda) = Ee^{i\lambda S_N}$ is the characteristic function of S_N. Changing variables $s = \lambda\sigma\sqrt{N}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma\sqrt{2\pi N} Eg(S_N - u) \\ &= \tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \textstyle\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi_N(\frac{s}{\sigma\sqrt{N}}) e^{-i\frac{su}{\sigma\sqrt{N}}} \hat{g}(\frac{s}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})ds. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

On the other hand, from the formula for the characteristic function of the Gaussian distribution and the Fourier inversion formula it follows that

$$e^{-\frac{u^2}{2N\sigma^2}} \int g d\mathcal{L}_h = \frac{\int g d\mathcal{L}_h}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-\frac{i\lambda u}{\sigma\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\lambda^2}{2})d\lambda. \tag{4.6}$$

Now, in the non-lattice case we write by (4.5) and (4.6),

$$|\sigma\sqrt{2\pi N} Eg(S_N - u) - e^{-\frac{u^2}{2N\sigma^2}} \int g d\mathcal{L}_0| \le I_1(N,T) + I_2(N,T) + I_3(N,\delta) + I_4(N,\delta,T) \tag{4.7}$$

where

$$I_1(N,T) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-T}^{T} |\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})\hat{g}(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}}) - e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}} \int g d\mathcal{L}_0|d\lambda,$$

$$I_2(T) = \frac{|\int g d\mathcal{L}_0|}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{|\lambda|>T} e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}} d\lambda,$$

$$I_3(N,\delta)=\frac{\|\hat g\|}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{L\sigma\sqrt{N}\ge|\lambda|\ge\delta\sigma\sqrt{N}}|\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})|d\lambda,$$

$$I_4(N,\delta,T)=\frac{\|\hat g\|}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\delta\sigma\sqrt{N}>|\lambda|>T}|\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})|d\lambda,$$

$\|\hat g\|=\sup_\lambda|\hat g|$ and in writing $I_3(N,\delta)$ we used the fact that $\hat g(s)=0$ for $s\notin[-L,L]$.

In the lattice case (2.22) we proceed in a slightly different way. First, observe that then

$$\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}}+\frac{2\pi k}{h})=\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})\quad\text{for all}\quad k\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{4.8}$$

Set

$$r(v)=\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}\hat g(v+\frac{2\pi k}{h}).$$

Taking into account that here $u\in\{kh:\,k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$ we can rewrite (4.5) in the following way

$$\sigma\sqrt{2\pi N}Eg(S_N-u)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-\frac{\pi\sigma\sqrt{N}}{h}}^{\frac{\pi\sigma\sqrt{N}}{h}}\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})e^{-i\frac{\lambda u}{\sigma\sqrt{N}}}r(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})d\lambda. \tag{4.9}$$

This together with (4.6) yields

(4.10)

$$|\sigma\sqrt{2\pi N}Eg(S_N-u)-e^{-\frac{u^2}{2N\sigma^2}}\int g d\mathcal{L}_h|\le J_1(N,T)+J_2(N,T)+J_3(N,\delta)+J_4(N,\delta,T)$$

where

$$J_1(N,T)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{-T}^{T}|\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})r(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})-e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}}\int g d\mathcal{L}_h|d\lambda,$$

$$J_2(T)=\frac{|\int g d\mathcal{L}_h|}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{|\lambda|>T}e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}}d\lambda,$$

$$J_3(N,\delta)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\frac{\pi\sigma\sqrt{N}}{h}\ge|\lambda|\ge\delta\sigma\sqrt{N}}|\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})||r(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})|d\lambda,$$

$$J_4(N,\delta,T)=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{\delta\sigma\sqrt{N}>|\lambda|>T}|\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})||r(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})|d\lambda.$$

By (the central limit) Theorem 2.2 for any λ,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\varphi_N(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})=e^{-\frac{\lambda^2}{2}}. \tag{4.11}$$

Furthermore, since g is continuous and integrable on $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\hat g(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})=\int g d\mathcal{L}_0. \tag{4.12}$$

In the lattice case (2.22) it follows from Ch. 10 in [4] that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}r(\frac{\lambda}{\sigma\sqrt{N}})=\int g d\mathcal{L}_h. \tag{4.13}$$

Now by (4.11)–(4.13) and the dominated convergence theorem we obtain that for any $T>0$,

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}I_1(N,T)=\lim_{N\to\infty}J_1(N,T)=0. \tag{4.14}$$

Next, clearly,

$$\lim_{T\to\infty} I_2(T) = \lim_{T\to\infty} J_2(T) = 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Thus, it remains to estimate $I_3(N,\delta)$, $I_4(N,\delta,T)$, $J_3(N,\delta)$ and $J_4(N,\delta,T)$. In order to do this we will need two following results which will be proved in the next sections for the setups of Theorems 2.6 and 2.7.

4.1. **Lemma.** *There exists an integer N_0 such that for all $N \ge N_0$,*

$$|\varphi_N(\theta)| \le e^{-qN} \tag{4.16}$$

which holds true in the non-lattice case for any $\theta \in [\delta, \delta^{-1}]$ and $\delta > 0$, while in the lattice case (2.22) the inequality (4.16) holds true for any $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}] \setminus [-\delta, \delta]$ and $\delta > 0$ with some $q = q_\delta > 0$ depending in both cases only on δ.

4.2. **Lemma.** *There exists an integer N_0 such that for all $N \ge N_0$,*

$$|\varphi_N(\theta)| \le e^{-rN\theta^2} \tag{4.17}$$

which holds true whenever $|\theta| \le \delta$ with some $r = r_\delta > 0$ depending only on δ which is supposed to be small enough.

Before proving Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 we will rely on them in order to estimate $I_3(N,\delta)$, $I_4(N,\delta,T)$, $J_3(N,\delta)$, $J_4(N,\delta,T)$ and to derive (2.24). Indeed, with δ small enough we estimate $I_3(N,\delta)$ and $J_3(N,\delta)$ by Lemma 4.1 to obtain

$$I_3(N,\delta) \le \frac{\|\hat g\|}{\sqrt{2\pi}}(L-\delta)\sigma\sqrt{N}e^{-q_\delta N} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N\to\infty \tag{4.18}$$

and

$$J_3(N,\delta) \le \frac{e^{-q_\delta N}}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\sigma\sqrt{N}\int_{-\pi/h}^{\pi/h}|r(s)|ds \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad N\to\infty. \tag{4.19}$$

Next, we estimate $I_4(N,\delta,T)$ and $J_4(N,\delta,T)$ by Lemma 4.2 to obtain

$$I_4(N,\delta,T) \le \frac{\|\hat g\|}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{|\lambda|>T} e^{-r\lambda^2/\sigma^2}d\lambda \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad T\to\infty \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$J_4(N,\delta,T) \le \frac{R}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int_{|\lambda|>T} e^{-r\lambda^2/\sigma^2}d\lambda \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad T\to\infty \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$R = \sup_{|u|\le\delta}|r(u)| \le hL \sup_{|v|\le L+\delta}|\hat g(v)| < \infty.$$

Thus, letting first $N\to\infty$ and then $T\to\infty$ we derive (2.24) from (4.14), (4.15) and (4.18)–(4.21). □

5. Positive transition densities case

First, as it is easy to understand, (2.5) implies ψ-mixing (see, for instance, [5] and Ch.7,21 in [3]). Since (2.5) holds true with $n_0 = \ell$ then we have

$$P(\ell,x,\Gamma) = \int_\Gamma p^{(\ell)}(x,y)d\eta(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\Gamma) = \int_\Gamma p(y)d\eta(y)$$

where the densities $p^{(\ell)}(x,y)$ and $p(y)$ satisfy $\gamma^{-1} \ge p^{(\ell)}(x,y) \ge \gamma$ and $\gamma^{-1} \ge p(y) \ge \gamma$ for all $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$. Observe that (2.18) holds true assuming only the right hand side

of (2.5). Indeed, since $|P(\ell,x,\Gamma)-P(\ell,y,\Gamma)|=|P(\ell,x,\mathcal{X}\setminus\Gamma)-P(\ell,y,\mathcal{X}\setminus\Gamma)|$ we can assume that $\eta(\Gamma)\ge\frac{1}{2}$. Then

$$|P(\ell,x,\Gamma)-P(\ell,y,\Gamma)|\le 1-\gamma\eta(\Gamma)\le 1-\frac{\gamma}{2},$$

and so (2.18) follows. Hence, the conditions of Theorem 2.4(i) are satisfied and since $F_\ell=0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. is excluded we conlude that the limiting variance σ^2 is positive.

Next, for each sequence $\bar{x}=(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)})\in\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ and a real number θ we define the (Fourier) operator

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{\bar{x}}(\theta)f(y)&=E_y\exp(i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},\xi_\ell))f(\xi_\ell)\\&=\int P(\ell,y,dz)\exp(i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},z))f(z)\end{aligned}$$

and the function

$$\rho_\theta(\bar{x})=\sup_{y\in\mathcal{X}}\int d\eta(v)|\int p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)\exp(i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},z))d\eta(z)|$$

where $p^{(\ell)}$ is the ℓ-step transition density of the Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$. Then for any $\bar{x}_1=(x_1^{(1)},...,x_1^{(\ell-1)})$, $\bar{x}_2=(x_2^{(1)},...,x_2^{(\ell-1)})\in\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}(5.1)\quad\|\Phi_{\bar{x}_1}(\theta)\Phi_{\bar{x}_2}(\theta)\|&=\sup_{f:\|f\|=1}\sup_y|\int d\eta(v)\exp(i\theta F(x_2^{(1)},...,x_2^{(\ell-1)},v))f(v)\\&\times\int p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)\exp(i\theta F(x_1^{(1)},...,x_1^{(\ell-1)},z))d\eta(z)|\le\rho_\theta(\bar{x}_1).\end{aligned}$$

The following arguments aimed at proving contraction properties of the operators $\Phi_{\bar{x}}(\theta)$ resemble Lemma 1.5 in [23] though in our situation there are additional parameters to take care about. Observe that for any function f and a probability measure ν,

$$\begin{aligned}|\int e^{if(x)}d\nu(x)|^2&=\int\int e^{i(f(x)-f(y))}d\nu(x)d\nu(y)\\&=\int\int\cos(f(x)-f(y))d\nu(x)d\nu(y)=1-2\int\sin^2\tfrac{(f(x)-f(y))}{2}d\nu(x)d\nu(y),\end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}(5.2)\qquad 1-|\int e^{if(x)}d\nu(x)|&\ge\tfrac{1}{2}(1-|\int e^{if(x)}d\nu(x)|^2)\\&\ge\int\sin^2\tfrac{(f(x)-f(y))}{2}d\nu(x)d\nu(y)=\tfrac{1}{4}\int\int|e^{if(x)}-e^{if(y)}|^2d\nu(x)d\nu(y)\end{aligned}$$

where we used the equality

$$|e^{if(x)}-e^{if(y)}|^2=2-2\cos(f(x)-f(y))=4\sin^2\frac{(f(x)-f(y))}{2}.$$

Now, let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two subsets of the unit circle such that

$$(5.3)\qquad\inf_{\xi\in\Gamma_1,\,\zeta\in\Gamma_2}|\xi-\zeta|=\delta>0\text{ and }\min_{j=1,2}\nu\{x:\,e^{if(x)}\in\Gamma_j\}=\varepsilon>0.$$

Then for $G_j=\{x:\,e^{if(x)}\in\Gamma_j\}$, $j=1,2$,

$$(5.4)\qquad\int_{\mathcal{X}}\int_{\mathcal{X}}|e^{if(x)}-e^{if(y)}|^2d\nu(x)d\nu(y)\ge\int_{G_1}\int_{G_2}|e^{if(x)}-e^{if(y)}|^2d\nu(x)d\nu(y)\ge\delta^2\varepsilon^2.$$

Next, we apply the above inequalities with $\nu=\nu_{y,v}$ defined for any Borel $G\subset\mathcal{X}$ by

$$\nu(G)=\frac{1}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}\int_G p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)d\eta(z).$$

Consider $g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(y)=\exp(i\theta F(\bar x,y))$, $\bar x=(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)})$ as a function of y. Then either $g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(y)$ does not depend on y η-a.e. or there exist Borel subsets $\Gamma_1=\Gamma_{1,\theta,\bar x}$ and $\Gamma_2=\Gamma_{2,\theta,\bar x}$ of the unit circle such that (5.3) holds true with some $\delta=\delta_{\theta,\bar x}$ and $\varepsilon=\varepsilon_{\theta,\bar x}$. In this case by (2.5) and the definition of ν,

$$\nu\{y:\, g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(y)\in\Gamma_j\}\ge\frac{\gamma^2}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}\eta\{y:\, g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(y)\in\Gamma_j\}\ge\frac{\gamma^2\varepsilon_{\theta,\bar x}}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}. \tag{5.5}$$

This together with (5.2)–(5.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} c_\theta(\bar x,y,v)&=p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)-|\int p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(z)d\eta(z)|\\ &=p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)(1-|\int g^{(\theta)}_{\bar x}(z)d\nu(z)|)\ge\tfrac{\gamma^4\delta^2_{\theta,\bar x}\varepsilon^2_{\theta,\bar x}}{4p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Set $U_y=\{v:\, p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)>2\}$. Then $\eta(U_y)\le\frac12\int_{U_y}p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)d\eta(v)\le\frac12$, and so

$$\int_{\mathcal X}\frac{d\eta(v)}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}\ge\int_{\mathcal X\setminus U_y}\frac{d\eta(v)}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}\ge\frac14. \tag{5.7}$$

This together with (5.6) yields that

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\le1-\inf_y\int c_\theta(\bar x,y,v)d\eta(v)\le1-\frac{1}{16}\gamma^4\delta^2_{\theta,\bar x}\varepsilon^2_{\theta,\bar x}. \tag{5.8}$$

Observe that (5.8) holds true for any $\theta\ne0$ in the non-lattice case if $B_{\bar x}=\emptyset$ (with $B_{\bar x}$ defined by (2.20)) and for any $\theta\in[-\frac{\pi}{h},\frac{\pi}{h}]\setminus\{0\}$ in the lattice case (2.22). Taking into account in addition that $\rho_\theta(\bar x)$ is continuous in θ we conclude that for any $\delta>0$ there exists $c_\delta(\bar x)>0$ such that

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\le1-c_\delta(\bar x) \tag{5.9}$$

whenever $\delta\le|\theta|\le\frac1\delta$ and $B_{\bar x}=\emptyset$ in the non-lattice case and whenever $\theta\in[-\frac{\pi}{h},\frac{\pi}{h}]\setminus(-\delta,\delta)$ in the lattice case (2.22).

On the other hand, since $F_\ell=0$ $\mu^{\ell-1}$-a.e. is excluded then $g^{(\theta)}_{x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)}}(y)$ cannot be constant in y for $\mu^{\ell-1}$-almost all $(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)})$ whenever $\delta\le|\theta|\le\frac1\delta$ in the non-lattice case and whenever $\theta\in[-\frac{\pi}{h},\frac{\pi}{h}]\setminus(-\delta,\delta)$ in the lattice case (2.22). It follows that for each such θ the inequality (5.9) holds true with $c_\delta(\bar x)>0$ for $\bar x\in\mathcal X^{\ell-1}$ belonging to a set having positive $\mu^{\ell-1}$-measure. Hence, for any $\delta>0$ there exist $c_\delta>0$ and a Borel set $G\subset\mathcal X^{\ell-1}$ such that for all θ from the corresponding ranges above

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\le1-c_\delta\quad\text{for all}\quad\bar x\in G\ \text{ and }\ \mu^{\ell-1}(G)\ge\varepsilon>0. \tag{5.10}$$

Next,

$$|\varphi_N(\theta)|\le E|E(\exp(i\theta(S_N-S_M))|\mathcal F_{\ell M})| \tag{5.11}$$

where $M=M(N)=N-2[\frac{N-N_\ell}{2}]$ and, recall, $N_\ell=[N(1-\frac{1}{2\ell})]+1$. By the Markov property we obtain that with probability one,

$$E(\exp(i\theta(S_N-S_M))|\mathcal F_{\ell M})=\prod_{k=M+1}^N\Phi_{\xi_k,\xi_{2k},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}}(\theta)\mathbf1(\xi_{\ell M}) \tag{5.12}$$

where $\mathbf1$ is the function equal 1 identically and we took into account that

$$jM-(j-1)N\ge[\frac N2]\quad\text{for all}\quad j=1,2,...,\ell. \tag{5.13}$$

Let $\{\xi_n^{(1)}\}$, $\{\xi_n^{(2)}\}, ..., \{\xi_n^{(\ell-1)}\}$ be $\ell-1$ independent copies of the stationary Markov chain $\{\xi_n\}$ with the initial distribution μ. Applying (3.1) subsequently $\ell-1$ times with $X = (\xi_k,\, k \le jN)$ and $Y = (\xi_{(j+1)n},\, n = M+1, M+2, ..., N)$, $j = \ell-1, \ell-2, ..., 1$ and using (5.13) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} &\big|E|\textstyle\prod_{k=M+1}^{N} \Phi_{\xi_k,\xi_{2k},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}}(\theta)\mathbf{1}| \\ &-E|\textstyle\prod_{k=M+1}^{N} \Phi_{\xi_k^{(1)},\xi_{2k}^{(2)},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\mathbf{1}|\big| \le (\ell-1)\psi([\tfrac{N}{2}]-2\ell). \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Next, introduce the Markov chain $\Xi(n) = (\xi_n^{(1)}, \xi_{2n}^{(2)}, ..., \xi_{(\ell-1)n}^{(\ell-1)})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ with the transition probability

$$P_\Xi(\bar{x}, \bar{\Gamma}) = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell-1} P(j, x^{(j)}, \Gamma_j)$$

where $\bar{x} = (x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(\ell-1)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{(\ell-1)}$ and $\bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_{\ell-1}$ is a Borel subset of $\mathcal{X}^{(\ell-1)}$. Observe that $\mu^{\ell-1} = \mu \times \cdots \times \mu$ is the stationary distribution of $\{\Xi(n)\}$ and that its transition probability $P_\Xi(\ell, \bar{x}, \cdot)$ has a transition density $p_\Xi^{(\ell)}$ with respect to $\eta^{\ell-1}$ satisfying

$$\gamma^{(\ell-1)} \le p_\Xi^{(\ell)}(\bar{x}, \cdot) \le \gamma^{-(\ell-1)}$$

where γ is the same as in (2.5).

Now, by (5.1) and the submultiplicativity of norms of operators,

$$\begin{aligned} &E|\textstyle\prod_{k=M+1}^{N} \Phi_{\xi_k^{(1)},\xi_{2k}^{(2)},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\mathbf{1}| \\ &\le E\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{2}]} \|\textstyle\prod_{k=M+2(j-1)+1}^{M+2j} \Phi_{\xi_k^{(1)},\xi_{2k}^{(2)},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\| \\ &\le E\textstyle\prod_{j=0}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{2}]} \rho_\theta(\Xi(M+2j+1)). \end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

It follows from (2.4), (5.1), (5.11), (5.12), (5.14) and (5.15) that in order to obtain (4.16) it suffices to show that for some N_0 and all $N \ge N_0$,

$$E\prod_{n=0}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{2}]} \rho_\theta(\Xi(2n+1)) \le e^{-\beta N} \tag{5.16}$$

for some $\beta = \beta_\delta > 0$ depending on δ which determines corresponding domains for θ in the non-lattice and the lattice cases. Observe that by (5.10),

$$P\{\Xi(n) \in G\} = P\{\Xi(1) \in G\} \ge \varepsilon. \tag{5.17}$$

Introduce the counting function

$$V(N) = \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{1}{2}(N-N_\ell)]} \mathbb{I}_G(\Xi(2n+1)),$$

where $\mathbb{I}_G(x) = 1$ if $x \in G$ and $= 0$, otherwise, and the events

$$\Gamma(N) = \{V(N) < \frac{\varepsilon N}{9\ell^2}\}.$$

Since $[\frac{1}{2}(N-N_\ell)] \ge \frac{N}{4\ell} - 2$ it follows from (5.17) and the large deviations results from [1] together with [7] applied to the Markov chain $\{\Xi(2\ell n+1),\, n \ge 0\}$ that

$$P(\Gamma(N)) \le \kappa^{-1} e^{-\kappa N} \tag{5.18}$$

for some $\kappa>0$ independent of N. Namely, by Lemma 2.5 in [7] the rate function on the second level of large deviations (for occupational measures) of the Markov chain $\Xi(2\ell n), n\geq 0$ has zero only at the invariant measure. According to [1] (see also [17]) large deviations in the τ-topology (generated by convergences on bounded Borel functions) have the same rate function. Thus we can apply the contraction principle (see [8]) in the τ-topology to conclude that for any bounded Borel function g on $\mathcal{X}^{(\ell-1)}$ the rate function on the first level of large deviations for sums of the form $\sum_{k=1}^n g(\Xi(2\ell k+1))$ has a unique zero at the integral of g with respect to the invariant measure. Taking $g=\mathbb{I}_G$ we will arrive at (5.18). Now by (5.9), for all $\theta\in[\delta,\delta^{-1}]$ or $\theta\in[-\frac{\pi}{h},\frac{\pi}{h}]\setminus[-\delta,\delta]$ depending on the case under consideration

$$\prod_{n=1}^{[\frac{1}{2}(N-N_\ell)]}\rho_\theta(\Xi(n))\leq \mathbb{I}_{\Gamma(N)}+(1-c_\delta)^{\frac{N\varepsilon}{9\ell^2}}$$

and (5.16) follows from (5.18), completing the proof of Lemma 4.1 in the setup of Theorem 2.6. □

Next, we derive Lemma 4.2. We start with the estimate (5.1) and the first inequality in (5.8) but now employing the Taylor formula we can represent $c_\theta(\bar x,y,v)$, $\bar x=(x_1^{(1)},...,x_1^{(\ell-1)})$ there for $|\theta|$ small enough in the following way (cf. Ch. 8 in [4]),

$$c_\theta(\bar x,y,v)=\frac{1}{2}\theta^2\int_{\mathcal{X}}p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)D(\bar x,y,z,v)d\eta(z)+\theta^2\hat\varphi_{\bar x,y,v}(\theta) \tag{5.19}$$

where for some constant $C>0$,

$$\hat\varphi_{\bar x,y,v}(\theta)\leq C\varphi_{\bar x}(\theta)\to 0 \text{ as } \theta\to 0 \text{ and}$$

$$D(\bar x,y,z,v)=\big(F(\bar x,z)-\frac{1}{p^{(2\ell)}(y,v)}\int p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)F(\bar x,z)d\eta(z)\big)^2.$$

Now, either $F(\bar x,z)$ does not depend on z η-a.s., i.e. $F_\ell(\bar x)=0$ η-a.s. which is excluded, or there exist Borel subsets $U_1=U_{1,\bar x}$ and $U_2=U_{2,\bar x}$ of the real line $\mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\inf_{z\in U_1,w\in U_2}|z-w|=\delta_{\bar x}>0 \text{ and } \min_{j=1,2}\eta(G_j(\bar x))=\varepsilon_{\bar x}>0.$$

where $G_j(\bar x)=\{z:\ F(\bar x,z)\in U_j\}$, $j=1,2$. In this case

$$\begin{aligned}\textstyle\int_{\mathcal{X}}p^{(\ell)}(y,z)p^{(\ell)}(z,v)D(\bar x,y,z,v)d\eta(z)&\geq\gamma^2\textstyle\int_{\mathcal{X}}D(\bar x,y,z,v)d\eta(z)\\ &\geq\gamma^2\inf_c\textstyle\int_{G_1(\bar x)\cup G_2(\bar x)}(F(\bar x,z)-c)^2d\eta(z)\\ &\geq\gamma^2\varepsilon_{\bar x}\inf_c\inf_{a\in U_1,b\in U_2}((a-c)^2+(b-c)^2)=\tfrac{1}{2}\gamma^2\varepsilon_{\bar x}\delta_{\bar x}^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

Now, by (5.8), (5.19) and (5.20) for $|\theta|$ small enough,

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\leq 1-\frac{\theta^2}{4}\gamma^2\varepsilon_{\bar x}\delta_{\bar x}^2+C\theta^2\varphi_{\bar x}(\theta). \tag{5.21}$$

Observe that by (2.1),

$$\hat D(\bar x)=\sup_y\int D(\bar x,y,z,v)d\eta(z)d\eta(v)\leq 2(1+\gamma^{-3})\int F^2(\bar x,z)d\eta(z)<\infty\ \mu^{\ell-1}\text{−a.e.}$$

Hence

$$\{\bar x:\ \hat D(\bar x)\leq L\}\uparrow\mathcal{Y} \text{ as } L\uparrow\infty$$

where $\mu^{\ell-1}(\mathcal{Y}) = 1$. This together with (5.21) yields that there exists $c > 0$ and a Borel set $G \subset \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ such that $\mu^{\ell-1}(G) = \varepsilon > 0$ and for all $|\theta|$ small enough,

$$\rho_\theta(\bar{x}) \le e^{-c\theta^2} \quad \text{whenever} \quad \bar{x} \in G. \tag{5.22}$$

Introduce, again, the counting function

$$W(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{[\frac{1}{2}(N-N_\ell)]} \mathbb{I}_G(\Xi(2n-1))$$

and the events

$$\Gamma(N) = \{W(N) < \varepsilon(\frac{N}{8\ell^2} - 1)\}.$$

Then, since $\rho_\theta(\bar{x}) \le 1$, we obtain by (5.22) that

$$\prod_{n=1}^{[\frac{1}{2}(N-N_\ell)]} \rho_\theta(\Xi(2n-1)) \le \exp(-c\varepsilon\theta^2(\frac{N}{8\ell^2} - 2)) + \mathbb{I}_{\Gamma(N)}, \tag{5.23}$$

Relying on the large deviations results from [7] and [1] as explained above we conclude that

$$P(\Gamma(N)) \le \kappa^{-1} e^{-\kappa N} \tag{5.24}$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ independent of N. Finally, (4.17) follows from (2.4), (5.1), (5.11), (5.12), (5.14), (5.15), (5.23) and (5.24), completing the proof of Lemma 4.2 in the setup of Theorem 2.6. □

5.1. **Remark.** Observe that weaker estimates in Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 of the form $|\varphi_N(\theta)| \le \frac{C}{N}$ for large $|\theta|$ and $|\varphi_N(\theta)| \le e^{-rN\theta^2} + \frac{C}{N}$ for small $|\theta|$, respectively, (where $C > 0$ is a constant) also suffice for our purposes in (4.18)–(4.21). Indeed, the integration in the definitions of I_3, J_3, I_4 and J_4 is taken over intervals with length of order $\sqrt{N}$, and so these expressions will still tend to zero as, first, $N \to \infty$ and then $T \to \infty$. But the above estimates do not require large deviations arguments since the latter was only needed in order to obtain exponential bounds (5.18) and (5.24) for probabilities of $\Gamma(N)$. On the other hand, in order to obtain a bound of order $\frac{C}{N}$ for these probabilities, which we want now, only the Chebyshev inequality is needed if we can show that for some constant $\tilde{C} > 0$,

$$\mathrm{Var}V(N) \le \tilde{C}N \text{ and } \mathrm{Var}W(N) \le \tilde{C}N.$$

It is well known (see, for instance, [13] or [3]) that the latter estimates will hold true if the Markov chain $\{\Xi(n)\}$ is α-mixing with a summable coefficient $\alpha(n)$, $n \ge 0$ which is much less than Assumption 2.1.

5.2. **Remark.** Most parts of the proof of Theorem 2.6 go through assuming only the right hand side of (2.5) with $n_0 = \ell$ replacing in the above arguments transition densities by the Radon-Nikodim derivatives of absolutely continuos parts of transition probabilities $P(\ell, x, \cdot)$ with respect to η and replacing μ-a.s. by η-a.s. since now these measures are not equivalent. According to Remark 5.1 the concluding part of the proof of Theorem 2.6 needed for application of Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 can be carried out just under α-mixing with a summable coefficient which is assured when the right hand side of (2.5) holds true (see [3]). Observe though that the arguments of Section 3 needed to ensure positivity of the asymptotic variance σ^2 as well as the comparison estimate (5.14) relied on the inequality (3.1) which, in

general, holds true only under ψ-mixing which is not ensured, in general, under just the right hand side of (2.5). Using the technique from Corollary 3.6 in [18] both (5.14) and estimates of Section 3 can be caried out under substantially weaker mixing conditions on expense of additional moment, growth and Hölder continuity assumptions on the function F. Observe that in the case of finite Markov chains exponentially fast ψ-mixing follows from the right hand side of (2.5), and so Theorem 2.7 can be proved under this condition only in place of the assumptions formulated there.

6. Finite state space case

First, observe that our assumption that Π^k for some k has all positive entries yields ψ-mixing of $\{\xi_n\}$ with (2.4) satisfied (see, for instance, [3], Ch.7). Clearly, Π^n has all positive entries for all $n \geq k$ and we take m so that $(m-2)\ell \geq k$. Furthermore, there exists a unique stationary distribution μ which gives a positive mass to each state j in $\mathcal{X}$. Since $F_\ell = 0$ μ^ℓ-a.e. is excluded then Theorem 2.4(ii) guaranties positivity of the limiting variance σ^2 in (2.12) provided $\delta_\ell < 1$ which is equivalent to the first inequality in (2.25) (see [6]).

Now, for each $\bar{x} = (x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(\ell-1)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ and a function f on $\mathcal{X}$ we can write

$$\Phi_{\bar{x}}(\theta)f(a) = \sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}} p_{ab}^{(\ell)} e^{i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},b)} f(b).$$

Let $\|f\| = 1$ then for $\bar{x}_n = (x_n^{(1)}, ..., x_n^{(\ell-1)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$, $n = 1, ..., m+2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\textstyle\prod_{n=1}^m \Phi_{\bar{x}_n}(\theta))f\| = \max_{a\in\mathcal{X}} |\textstyle\sum_{a_1,...,a_m\in\mathcal{X}} p_{aa_1}^{(\ell)} \\ \times e^{i\theta F(x_1^{(1)},...,x_1^{(\ell-1)},a_1)} p_{a_1a_2}^{(\ell)} e^{i\theta F(x_2^{(1)},...,x_2^{(\ell-1)},a_2)} \\ \times \cdots \times p_{a_{m-1}a_m}^{(\ell)} e^{i\theta F(x_m^{(1)},...,x_m^{(\ell-1)},a_m)} f(a_m)| \leq \rho_\theta(\bar{x}_{m-1}) \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where for each $\bar{x} = (x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(\ell-1)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\theta(\bar{x}) = \max_a \textstyle\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}} p_{ab}^{((m-2)\ell)} \sum_{d\in\mathcal{X}} |\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}} p_{bc}^{(\ell)} \\ \times e^{i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)} p_{cd}^{(\ell)}|. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_{ab}^{((m-2)\ell)} > 0$ for any $a, b \in \mathcal{X}$ then $\rho_\theta(\bar{x}) = 1$ if and only if for any $b \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\sum_{d\in\mathcal{X}} |\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}} p_{bc}^{(\ell)} e^{i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)} p_{cd}^{(\ell)}| = 1. \tag{6.2}$$

This will hold true if and only if $g_{\bar{x}}^{(\theta)}(c) = e^{i\theta F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)}$ is constant in c on each set $\mathcal{X}_{b,d} = \{c \in \mathcal{X} : p_{bc}^{(\ell)}, p_{cd}^{(\ell)} > 0\}$. But, in view of the assumption (2.25) for any $c, c' \in \mathcal{X}$ there exist $b, d \in \mathcal{X}$ such that $p_{bc}^{(\ell)}, p_{cd}^{(\ell)}, p_{bc'}^{(\ell)}, p_{c'd}^{(\ell)} > 0$. Hence, if (6.2) holds true then $g_{\bar{x}}^{(\theta)}(c)$ is constant in c on the whole $\mathcal{X}$. Since we assume that F_ℓ is not zero identically then $g_{x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)}}^{(\theta)}(y)$ cannot be constant in y for $\mu^{\ell-1}$-almost all $(x^{(1)}, ..., x^{(\ell-1)})$ whenever $\delta \leq |\theta| \leq \frac{1}{\delta}$ in the non-lattice case and whenever $\theta \in [-\frac{\pi}{h}, \frac{\pi}{h}] \setminus (-\delta, \delta)$ in the lattice case (2.22). It follows that $\rho_\theta(\bar{x}) < 1$ for each such θ and for $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ belonging to a set having positive $\mu^{\ell-1}$-measure. Since ρ_θ is continuous in θ this holds true uniformly in θ in the corresponding compact

domains above. Hence, for any $\delta > 0$ there exist $c_\delta > 0$ and a Borel set $G \subset \mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ such that for all θ from the corresponding ranges above

$$\rho_\theta(\bar{x}) \le 1 - c_\delta \quad \text{for all} \quad \bar{x} \in G \ \text{ and } \ \mu^{\ell-1}(G) \ge \varepsilon > 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Next, take $M = M(N) = N - m[\frac{N-N_\ell}{m}]$ and proceed as in (5.11)–(5.14). Introduce again the Markov chain $\Xi_n = (\xi_n^{(1)}, \xi_{2n}^{(2)}, ..., \xi_{(\ell-1)n}^{(\ell-1)})$ on $\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ with the transition probabilities

$$p_\Xi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}) = \prod_{j=1}^{\ell-1} p_{a^{(j)}b^{(j)}}$$

where $\bar{a} = (a^{(1)}, ..., a^{(\ell-1)})$, $\bar{b} = (b^{(1)}, ..., b^{(\ell-1)}) \in \mathcal{X}^{(\ell-1)}$. If $\Pi_\Xi = (p_\Xi(\bar{a}, \bar{b}))$ is the corresponding transition matrix then, clearly, $\Pi_\Xi^{(m-2)\ell}$ has all positive entries. Now similarly to (5.15),

$$\begin{aligned} &E|\textstyle\prod_{k=M+1}^{N} \Phi_{\xi_k^{(1)},\xi_{2k}^{(2)},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\mathbf{1}| \\ &\le E\textstyle\prod_{j=1}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{m}]} \|\prod_{k=M+m(j-1)+1}^{M+mj} \Phi_{\xi_k^{(1)},\xi_{2k}^{(2)},...,\xi_{(\ell-1)k}^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\| \\ &\le E\textstyle\prod_{j=0}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{m}]} \rho_\theta(\Xi(M+mj+1)). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Thus, in order to obtain (4.16) it suffices to show that for some N_0 and all $N \ge N_0$,

$$E \prod_{n=0}^{[\frac{N-N_\ell}{m}]} \rho_\theta(\Xi(mn+1)) \le e^{-\beta N} \tag{6.5}$$

for some $\beta = \beta_\delta > 0$ depending on δ which determines corresponding domains for θ in the non-lattice and the lattice cases.

Introduce, again, the counting function

$$V(N) = \sum_{n=0}^{[\frac{1}{m}(N-N_\ell)]} \mathbb{I}_G(\Xi(mn+1)).$$

where $\mathbb{I}_G(x) = 1$ if $x \in G$ and $= 0$, otherwise, and the events

$$\Gamma(N) = \{V(N) < \frac{\varepsilon N}{9\ell^2 m}\}.$$

Since $[\frac{1}{m}(N-N_\ell)] \ge \frac{N}{4\ell} - 2$ it follows from (6.3) and the large deviations results from Section 3.1 in [8] together with [7] applied to the Markov chain $\{\Xi(nm+1),\, n \ge 0\}$ that

$$P(\Gamma(N)) \le \kappa^{-1} e^{-\kappa N} \tag{6.6}$$

for some $\kappa > 0$ independent of N. Namely, by Lemma 2.5 in [7] the rate function of the second level of large deviations (for occupational measures) of the Markov chain $\Xi(nm+1), n \ge 0$ has zero only at the invariant measure. The proof there depends only on the specific form of the rate function and it is shown in Section 3.1 in [8] that the Markov chains satisfying our conditions have exactly the same form of the rate function. Since $\mathcal{X}$ is a finite set any function is continuous and we can use directly the contraction principle to conclude that for any function g on $\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ the rate function on the first level of large deviations for sums of the form $\sum_{k=0}^{n} g(\Xi(km+1))$ has a unique zero at the integral of g with respect to

the invariant measure. Now, taking $g=\mathbb{I}_G$ we will arrive at (6.6). In fact, in our circumstances we can obtain (6.6) directly from [21] and [20]. Now we conclude the proof of (6.5) and of the whole Lemma 4.1 (in the setup of Theorem 2.7) in the same way as in the previous section. □

Next, we derive Lemma 4.2 in the present setup. Employing the Taylor formula we can write for $|\theta|$ small enough (cf. Ch.8 in [4]) that

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\le 1-\tfrac{\theta^2}{2}\inf_a\sum_{b\in\mathcal{X}}p_{ab}^{((m-2)\ell)}\sum_{d\in\mathcal{X}}\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}}p_{bc}^{(\ell)} \tag{6.7}$$
$$\times D(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},b,c,d)p_{cd}^{(\ell)}+\theta^2\varphi_{x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)$$

where $\bar x=(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)})$, $\mathcal{X}_{bd}=\{c:\ p_{bc}^{(\ell)},\,p_{cd}^{(\ell)}>0\}$, $\varphi_{x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)}}(\theta)\to 0$ as $\theta\to 0$ and

$$D(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},b,c,d)$$
$$=\big(F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)-\tfrac{1}{p_{bd}^{(2\ell)}}\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}}p_{bc}^{(\ell)}p_{cd}^{(\ell)}F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)\big)^2$$

while we set $\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}}=0$ whenever $\mathcal{X}_{bd}=\emptyset$. Observe that

$$\sum_{c\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}}p_{bc}^{(\ell)}D(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},b,c,d)p_{cd}^{(\ell)}=0 \tag{6.8}$$

if and only if $F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)$ does not depend on $c\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}$. But in view of (2.25) for any $c,c'\in\mathcal{X}$ there exist $b,d\in\mathcal{X}$ such that $c,c'\in\mathcal{X}_{bd}$. It follows that (6.8) holds true for any $b,d\in\mathcal{X}$ if and only if $F(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)$ does not depend on c on the whole $\mathcal{X}$, i.e. $F_\ell(x^{(1)},...,x^{(\ell-1)},c)=0$ for all $c\in\mathcal{X}$. Since the latter equality cannot hold true identically by our assumptions we conclude that there exists a nonempty $G\subset\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ such that for some $r>0$ and all $\bar x\in G$,

$$\rho_\theta(\bar x)\le 1-r\theta^2\le e^{-r\theta^2} \tag{6.9}$$

provided $|\theta|$ is small enough. In present circumstances $\mu^{\ell-1}(G)>0$ as for any nonempty subset of $\mathcal{X}^{\ell-1}$ and we complete the proof of Lemma 4.2 (in the present setup) proceeding in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 above and at the end of the previous section by introducing a counting function of arrivals of $\Xi(mn+1)$ to G, using (6.4) and (6.9), and relying on the same large deviations argument. □

References

[1] E. Bolthausen, *Markov process large deviations in τ-topology*, Stoch. Proc. Appl. 25(1987), 95–108.

[2] N. Bourbaki, *Integration I*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.

[3] R.C. Bradley, *Introduction to Strong Mixing Conditions*, Kendrick Press, Heber City, UT, 2007.

[4] L. Breiman, *Probability*, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992.

[5] J.R. Blum, D.L. Hanson, L.H. Koopmans, *On the strong law of large numbers for a class of stochastic processes*, Z. Wahrsch. verw. Geb, 2(1963), 1–11.

[6] R.L. Dobrushin, *Central limit theorem for nonstationary Markov chains I, II*, Theory Probab. Appl. 1(1956), 65–80, 329–383.

[7] M.D. Donsker and S.R.S. Varadhan, *Asymptotic evaluation of certain Markov process expectations for large time, I*, Comm. Pure. Appl. Math. 28(1975), 1–47.

[8] A. Dembo and O. Zeitouni, *Large Deviations Techniques and Applications*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.

[9] H. Furstenberg, *Nonconventional ergodic averages*, Proc. Symp. Pure Math. 50, 43–56 (1990).

[10] N. Giesbrecht, *Bounds for sums of random variables over a Markov chain*, Stoch. Proc. Appl. 53(1994), 269–283.

[11] R. Giuliano-Antonini and Z.S. Szewczak, *An almost sure local limit theorem for Markov chains*, Stat.& Probab. Letters 83 (2013), 573–579.

[12] H. Hennion and L. Hervé, *Limit Theorems for Markov Chains and Stochastic Properties of Dynamical Systems by Quasi-Compactness*, Lect. Notes Math. 1766, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.

[13] I.A. Ibragimov and Yu.V. Linnik, *Independent and Stationary Sequences of Random Variables*, Wolters–Noordhoff, Groningen (1971).

[14] Yu. Kifer, *Optimal stopping and strong approximation theorems*, Stochastics 79(2007), 253–273.

[15] Yu. Kifer, *Nonconventional limit theorems*, Probab. Th. Rel. Fields 148 (2010), 71–106.

[16] Yu. Kifer, *A nonconventional strong law of large numbers and fractal dimensions of some multiple recurrence sets*, Stoch. Dynam. 12(2012), 1150023.

[17] I. Kontoyiannis and S.P.Meyn, *Large deviations asymptotics and the spectral theory of multiplicative regular Markov processes*, Electr. J. Probab. 10(2005), 61–123.

[18] Yu. Kifer and S.R.S. Varadhan, *Nonconventional limit theorems in discrete and continuous time via martingales*, Ann. Probab. 42(2014), 649–688.

[19] J.G. Kemeny, J.L. Snell, A.W. Knapp, *Denumerable Markov Chains*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.

[20] A. Kontorovich and R. Weiss, *Uniform Chernoff and Dvoretzky-Kiefer-Wolfowitz-type inequalities for Markov chains and related problems*, arXiv: 1207.4678 (2013).

[21] P. Lezaud, *Chernoff-type bound for finite Markov chains*, Ann. Appl. Probab. 8(1998), 849–867.

[22] S.V. Nagaev, *Some limit theorems for stationary Markov chains*, Theory Probab. Appl. 2(1957), 378–406.

[23] S.V. Nagaev, *More exact statements of limit theorems for homogeneous Markov chains*, Theory Probab. Appl. 6(1961), 62–81.

[24] M. Peligrad, *Central limit theorem for triangular arrays of non-homogeneous Markov chains*, Probab. Th. Rel. Fields 154(2012), 409–428.

[25] G.O. Roberts and J.S. Rosenthal, *Geometric ergodicity and hybrid Markov chains*, Electron. Commun. Probab. 2(1997), 13–25.

[26] S. Sethuraman and S.R.S. Varadhan, *A martingale proof of Dobrushin's theorem for non-homogeneous Markov chains*, Electron. J. Probab. 10(2005), 1221–1235.

Institute of Mathematics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel
E-mail address: yeor.hafouta@mail.huji.ac.il, kifer@math.huji.ac.il